

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JEFFERY JACKSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:25-cv-210

v.

HON. JANE M. BECKERING

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Defendants.

/

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, initiated this action against the United States of America and “The Judiciary” (ECF No. 1). The matter was referred to the Magistrate Judge, who reviewed Plaintiff’s complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) to determine whether it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R), recommending that this action be dismissed. The matter is presently before the Court on Plaintiff’s objections to the Report and Recommendation. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3), the Court has performed *de novo* consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections have been made. The Court denies the objections and issues this Opinion and Order.

The Magistrate Judge observed that it “is difficult to discern what Plaintiff is attempting to assert in this lawsuit. ... the Court simply cannot discern the nature of Plaintiff’s claims or the facts on which such claims are premised” (ECF No. 6 at PageID.15–16). Accordingly, the

Magistrate Judge concluded that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted. Plaintiff objects that the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation to dismiss this case “violates controlling constitutional, treaty, and appellate law and fails to apply Supreme Court precedent protecting Moorish American nationality, religious sovereignty, and due process rights” (ECF No. 7 at PageID.17). Plaintiff lists legal authorities and legal principles and states legal conclusions that reference general factual assertions. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 7 at PageID.19 (“By failing to recognize Plaintiff as a Moorish American and refusing to recognize the Moorish Science Temple of America as a religious jural society, the United States has engaged in unlawful denationalization”). But these statements wholly fail to show that Plaintiff’s Complaint provides “sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 677–78 (2009). Therefore, Plaintiff’s argument fails to demonstrate any factual or legal error in the Magistrate Judge’s analysis or conclusion that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted.

Finally, the Court notes that Plaintiff contends that the Magistrate Judge “improperly denied Plaintiff an opportunity to amend” (ECF No. 7 at PageID.20). However, the Sixth Circuit has held “that the district courts are not to permit plaintiffs to amend a complaint in order to avoid dismissal pursuant to [§1915(e)(2)].” *Benson v. O’Brian*, 179 F.3d 1014, 1016 (6th Cir. 1999). Even if that were not the case, a motion to amend is properly denied where it does not state the proposed grounds for amendment. *Evans v. Pearson Enters., Inc.*, 434 F.3d 839, 853 (6th Cir. 2006). Here, Plaintiff has not explained proposed grounds for amendment.

Accordingly, this Court adopts the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation as the Opinion of this Court. A Judgment will be entered consistent with this Opinion and Order. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 58. Because this action was filed *in forma pauperis*, this Court certifies, pursuant

to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith. *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 610 (6th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds by *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 206, 211-12 (2007).

Therefore:

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Objections (ECF No. 7) are DENIED and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 6) is APPROVED and ADOPTED as the Opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal of this decision would not be taken in good faith.

Dated: March 18, 2025

/s/ Jane M. Beckering  
JANE M. BECKERING  
United States District Judge